REMARKS

This response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided generally to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Claims 1-99 are pending in this application. Claims 1-99 have been rejected. In this response, claims 1-59, 63-64, 66-67, 74-76, 82, and 99 have been amended. Claims 83-98 have been cancelled. Claims 100-104 have been newly added. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action dated July 2, 2007, are respectfully requested in view of the remarks below.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-16, 19-32, 34-45, 47-50, 52-55, 58-68, 71-83, 86-96 and 99

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6-16, 19-32, 34-45, 47-50, 52-55, 58-68, 71-83, 86-96 and 99 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Motosyuku, et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,566, hereinafter referred to as 'Motosyuku') in view of Ball (U.S. Patent No. 5,686,942, hereinafter referred to as 'Ball'). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 83 and 86-96 have been cancelled.

The cited references do not disclose all the subject matter in the independent claims 1, 32, 55, and 99

Applicant respectfully submits that when viewed as a whole, the cited references do not show the subject matter recited in the pending claims.

> "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)."

Applicant respectfully submits that Motosyuku and Ball do not render obvious applicant's independent claims since when viewed individually or as a whole, Motosyuku and Ball do not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 32, 55, and 99.

Reference 'Motosyuku'

Motosyuku does not teach detecting "translational movement of a display device" by "an accelerometer that is internal to the computer system";

Motosyuku does not teach varying the portion of the object that is displayed on the display device in a manner that corresponds to the "translational movement" of the display device detected by the accelerometer;

Motosyuku describes a small-sized information processor which is used while being held in one hand, and which can scroll a display screen in accordance with a "tilt" (Abstract, Motosyuku).

The Examiner states that Motosyuku discloses "a hand-held computer having a digital processor, a motion sensor (104) for tracking movements of the display ... and

adjusting the displayed information according to the movements of the display" (Page 3 of Final Office action mailed July 2 2007).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Motosyuku, a tilt sensor is used to detect a tilt angle and tilt direction of the device and scrolls the display screen of the display according to the detected tilt. However, in Motosyuku, only tilt angles and tilt directions of the display are detected. Motosyuku does not otherwise detect "movement" or "translational movement" of the display, as claimed in claim 1.

The Examiner acknowledges this.

The Examiner states "Motosyuku controls the display by rotational movement instead of translational movement" (Page 3 of Final Office action mailed July 2, 2007).

Therefore, since Motosyuku does not teach "translational movement" detection, there is no need for Motosyuku to incorporate an accelerometer to the system. Indeed, Motosyuku does not disclose the use of any type of motion sensors such as an accelerometer beyond a tilt sensor to detecting tilt direction and tile angle of the display.

Since Motosyuku does not teach the detection of "translational movements", the system of Motosyuku is also unable to vary "the displayed portion of the object that is displayed on the display device in a manner that corresponds to the translational movement of the display device detected by the accelerometer", as claimed in claim 1.

Ball does not cure the deficiency.

Reference 'Ball'

Ball does not teach detecting "translational movement of a display device" by "an accelerometer that is internal to the computer system";

Ball does not teach varying the portion of the object that is displayed on the display device in a manner that corresponds to the "translational movement" of the display device detected by the accelerometer;

The Examiner states that Ball teaches a system that generates input data to "control a display based on the translational movement of the display relative to a reference target" (Page 4 of Final Office action mailed July 2, 2007).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ball describes a remote computer input system which detects a point source on an operator (Title, Ball). In Ball, the motion of the operator is detected and used to control the movement of a cursor in a computer system. However, Ball detects the motion of the operator, rather than the motion of a display device, as claimed.

Furthermore, Ball detects the motion of an operator using a motion detector "external" to the computer system which is mounted on the display (see **FIG. 1** of Ball), rather than an accelerometer that is "internal to the computer system", as claimed by applicant.

For example, in Ball:

> *"The **motion of the nose 22 of the operator** 12 is detected by a motion detector 24... The **motion detector** 24 is **mounted on the display** 14." (Ball, Col. 3, lines 28-31)*
>
> *"... the cursor is **controlled** to correspond to the **motion of the tip of the nose 22 of the operator**..." (Ball, Col. 3, lines 18-20)*

Thus, in Ball, the motion of the operator is detected to control a computer cursor. Ball does not teach that "translational movement of a display device" is detected,

as claimed by applicant. Furthermore, the motion of the operator, is detected by a motion detector mounted on the display rather than by "an accelerometer that is internal to the computer system", as claimed by applicant.

The Examiner states that "it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a camera housing in the display device and generate input data to control a display based on the translational movement of the display relative to a reference target as taught by Ball in the device of Motosyuku so as to provide simple and intuitive method to enter control data to the computer" (Page 4 of Office action mailed July 2, 2007).

Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

1. Motosyuku's teachings are limited to tilt detection and Ball's teachings are limited to detection of an operator, the combination thereof does not include the claimed subject matter of detecting "translational movement" of the "display device", as claimed.

2. Furthermore, neither Motosyuku nor Ball teach that translational movement of the display device is detected by "an accelerometer that is internal to the computer system", as claimed.

Based on at least the above stated reasons, without admitting to the propriety of the combination of Motosyuku and Ball in a manner suggested by the Examiner in the Final Office Action mailed July 2, 2007, the resulting system and functions would be different from what is claimed in applicant's independent claim 1.

Applicant submits that the independent claim 1 is patentable over Motosyuku, Ball, and the alleged combination of Motosyuku and Ball. Independent claims 32, 55, and 99 are also patentable for at least the same and/or similar reasons.

Thus, at least for the above stated reasons, the withdrawal of the rejection for the independent claims 32, 55, and 99 are respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims

Claims 4, 5, 33, 56, 57, 84 and 85

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, 33, 56, 57, 84 and 85 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Motosyuku, et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,566) in view of Ball (.S. Patent No. 5,686,942) as applied to claims 1 and 33 above, and further in view of Kang (U.S. Patent No. 6,009,210, hereinafter referred to as 'Kang'). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 84 and 85 have been cancelled.

Claims 17, 18, 46, 51, 69, 70, 97 and 98

The Examiner has rejected claims 17, 18, 46, 51, 69, 70, 97 and 98 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Motosyuku, et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,602,566) in view of Ball (U.S. Patent No. 5,686,942) as applied to claim 1, 16, 45, 68 and 96 above, and further in view of Detlef (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,403, hereinafter referred to as 'Detlef'). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 97 and 98 have been cancelled.

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, applicant's silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim. Therefore, the remaining dependent claims are also patentable over the cited references. The withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested for claims 2-31, 33-54, and 56-82.

CONCLUSION

In light of the amendments and the preceding arguments, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a conference would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned counsel at (650) 838-4306 to arrange for such a conference.

No fees are believed to be due; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment in fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2207.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/16/2009

Xenyuh Pu
Reg. No. 59,141

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 22918
Perkins Coie LLP
P.O. Box 1208
Seattle, WA 98111-1208
(650) 838-4300